United Nations A/HRC/32/45/Add.3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 May 2016

English only

Human Rights Council
Thirty-second session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on multi-stakeholder engagement across "Protect, Respect and Remedy" – Reflections from discussions at the 2015 annual United Nations Forum on Business and Human Rights

Note by the Secretariat

The present report, submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 26/22 and 17/4, provides key insights from two case study-based sessions entitled "Multi-Stakeholder Engagement Across All Three Pillars", which took place on 16 and 17 November 2015 as part of the fourth annual Forum on Business and Human Rights.

GE.16-08580(E)

1608580

Please recycle

Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on multi-stakeholder action to protect and respect human rights*

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction and background	3
II.	Topic and objectives of the session	4
III.	Case studies involving multi-stakeholder engagement across "Protect, Respect and Remedy"	5
	A. Identifying cases	5
	B. Case study one: "2020 Tea Revitalisation Programme" – Malawi	6
	C. Case study two: Thilawa Special Economic Zone (SEZ) – Myanmar	6
	D. Case study three: Labour rights in Florida's tomato growing industry – U.S.A.	7
	E. Case study four: Multi-stakeholder in the aftermath of the Kingsland factory closure – Cambodia	7
IV.	Reflections from the Forum sessions on "Multi-stakeholder engagement across all three pillars"	8
V.	Working Group conclusions and recommendations	11

* Reproduced as received.

I. Introduction and background

1. The Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights[1] clarify how to operationalize the State duty to protect human rights from business impacts, the corporate responsibility to respect human rights and the need for victims to be given access to effective remedy. While there has been considerable attention on how to step up action on *each* of these three pillars of the Guiding Principles, less treatment has been given to how they interact in concrete situations. This was the focus of discussions at the 2015 annual Forum on Business and Human Rights, from which the present report seeks to transmit the key lessons and insights.

2. The present report provides a summary and insights from two case study-based sessions entitled "Multi-Stakeholder Engagement Across All Three Pillars", which took place on 16 and 17 November 2015 as part of the fourth annual Forum on Business and Human Rights.[2] The purpose of the sessions was to exemplify constructive and meaningful multi-stakeholder engagement and dialogue on good practices, lessons learnt, challenges and innovations found in the complexity involved in implementation of the Guiding Principles across all three pillars of "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework. The four case studies included perspectives of different stakeholders (civil society and business, as well as government in two), covered different sectors (industrial infrastructure investment, agricultural production, and retail and garment sourcing), and regions (the Americas, Africa and Asia):

- the "2020 Tea Revitalisation Programme" in Malawi
- the Thilawa Special Economic Zone in Myanmar
- multi-stakeholder engagement to address impacts of the shutdown of the Kingsland garment factory in Cambodia
- the "Fair Food Program" in Florida's tomato growing sector

3. The sessions were convened by the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, and organized jointly with the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (BHRRC) and the Global Business Initiative on Human Rights (GBI). The sessions built on a similar session held at the 2014 Forum on Business and Human Rights.[3]

4. The Working Group would like to thank BHRRC and GBI for their collaboration in organizing the sessions and for having prepared a report containing a detailed summary and analysis of the discussions.[4] The present document is based on that report.[5] In the concluding section, the Working Group highlights observations and recommendations for the consideration of stakeholders.

---

[1] "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework", Annex to A/HRC/17/4.

[2] Full concept note with details about speakers is available at http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Business/ForumSession4/ConnectingThreePillarsOnTheGroundFact.pdf. Videos of the sessions can be accessed via: http://webtv.un.org/watch/session-o-multi-stakeholder-action-forum-on-business-and-human-rights-2015/4615868684001

[3] See A/HRC/29/28/Add.3

[4] See the "Multi-stakeholder engagement across 'Protect, Respect, Remedy'" session report by the Business & Human Rights Resource Centre and the Global Business Initiative on Human Rights (GBI), forthcoming at www.business-humanrights.org and www.global-business-initiative.org

[5]

5. The overall aim of reporting on the thematic sessions is to make available to a wider audience concrete experiences and lessons presented at the Forum in order to build common knowledge and support further efforts to implement the Guiding Principles. The primary purpose in discussing the case studies is to facilitate the exchange of experience and mutual learning among business, civil society and Governments.

6. The Working Group would like to facilitate more such focused and action-oriented discussion around specific cases and experiences. In that regard, it commends the companies, non-governmental organizations and States that shared their experiences and perspectives at the Forum.

7. The work around these sessions was carried out pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 17/4 and 26/22, which, inter alia, provides the Working Group with a mandate to identify, exchange and promote good practices and lessons learned on the implementation of the Guiding Principles. Also pursuant to these resolutions, the Working Group is mandated to guide the annual Forum on Business and Human Rights that was established to discuss trends and challenges in the implementation of the Guiding Principles and promote dialogue and cooperation on issues linked to business and human rights, including challenges faced in particular sectors, operational environments and in relation to specific rights and groups, as well as identifying good practices.

II. Explanation of the session topic and objectives

8. Since the endorsement of the Guiding Principles by the Human Rights Council in 2011, a great deal of focus and debate has centred on how each pillar of the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework is being implemented in practice. Generally speaking, conferences, research, projects and dialogue address the detailed, technical implementation and challenges of delivering on the promise of each pillar. This is necessary and urgent given that implementation of the Guiding Principles is nascent and requires policy, process and practice innovations within complex institutions.

9. Nonetheless, there is often less attention given to instances in which all three pillars of the "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework are, or need to be, applied simultaneously to bring about meaningful change. This is problematic, since lack of simultaneous action will only ever lead to partial or passing human rights protection. Neither effective State action alongside bad corporate conduct, nor good quality human rights due diligence alongside lack of access to remedy, nor strong remedial avenues without company capacity to prevent adverse impacts can deliver strong solutions to business-related human rights challenges, especially the most severe and irremediable ones. This holistic application of the Guiding Principles is, arguably, where their power and intrinsic value ultimately lies. As the introduction to the Guiding Principles notes, "[E]ach pillar is an essential component in an inter-related and dynamic system of preventative and remedial measures."[5]

10. The commentary to the General Principles reinforces this point by reminding that "[T]hese Guiding Principles should be understood as a coherent whole and should be read, individually and collectively, in terms of their objective of enhancing standards and practices with regard to business and human rights so as to achieve tangible results for affected individuals and communities, and thereby also contributing to a socially sustainable globalization."[6]

[5] Paragraph 6, A/HRC/17/4.
[6] General Principles, Annex, A/HRC/17/4.

11. The annual Forum continues to provide an ideal space for stakeholders to share progress and practices, to facilitate peer learning and to contribute to the understanding of the state of play of "on-the-ground" implementation. In light of the relative lack of spaces in which the Guiding Principles are considered collectively, these sessions provided a timely and necessary support for multi-stakeholder dialogue in which all three pillars – "Protect, Respect and Remedy" - are considered in unison.

12. The core purpose of the sessions was to demonstrate the transformative transformational power of approaches to business and human rights that integrate all three pillars of the Guiding Principles, and to inspire practitioners and experts advocates in business, government, and civil society to adopt this approach together, especially where salient human rights risks exist within business operations and supply chains. The sessions sought to:

- identify examples where all three pillars have begun to be applied together via collaboration/ coordination among States, businesses and civil society – with a strong focus on delivering results "on the ground"
- make use of the diverse expertise and perspectives at the annual Forum to support speakers and participants to address challenges they are facing
- identify cross-cutting lessons, challenges, capacity needs and opportunities when seeking to deliver results at a local level via coordinated action
- establish how the Working Group and others can support better coordinated action and collaboration
- encourage multi-stakeholder dialogue and learning about the inter-relationship of "Protect, Respect, and Remedy" – both conceptually and in practice.

III. Overview: case studies involving multi-stakeholder engagement across "Protect, Respect and Remedy"[7]

A. Identifying cases

13. In the months leading into the annual Forum, the Working Group, BHRRC and GBI conducted joint research to identify situations in which all three pillars of the Guiding Principles were being considered and acted upon. The initial research did surface a number of candidate cases, and when selecting from these the organisers focused on profiling examples that when considered together:

- addressed a diversity of industries and geographies
- demonstrated engagement from diverse actors including large global brands and smaller domestic suppliers; diverse ministries/agencies in home States and host States; international and local NGOs; worker organisations and community organisations; and affected individuals
- initiatives and programmes at different stages of maturity and evolution.

[7] Background papers are available at www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Business/Forum/Pages/Submissions.aspx.

14. Note that the research and identification process was very basic. Broader and more sustained efforts are needed to identify such cases, with particular attention to where national and local government agencies have stepped into leadership roles.

B. Case study one: "2020 Tea Revitalisation Programme" – Malawi

15. The first case presented was the "Malawi 2020 Tea Revitalization Programme", a multi-stakeholder partnership aimed at delivering a living wage for workers in the Malawi tea growing sector. A core issue is that many workers, especially women, are not able to work their way out of poverty, even in productive and profitable supply chains.

16. The Ethical Tea Partnership, which comprises 40 companies that buy and trade tea, suggested that, despite the attention to audits, certifications and paying legal wages, companies did not fully understand the problem. When presented with an evidence-based analysis carried out by Oxfam, however, companies begun to realise that a national minimum wage did not mean that workers earned enough to meet their family's basic needs. It was noted that all actors – companies, local tea producers, the Government, non-governmental organizations and trade unions – had to be involved if improvements, such as a move to a living wage, were to be made. The approach taken by Oxfam of helping companies to deal with the findings in a transparent manner and without shaming those who stepped forward to tackle the issue was considered as constructive by the involved parties.

C. Case study two: Thilawa Special Economic Zone (SEZ) – Myanmar

17. The second case was that of the Thilawa Special Economic Zone in Myanmar, a development project that affected 81 households and led to negative human rights impacts, including relocation and the loss of farmland, livelihood, educational opportunities and access to clean water. Before 2012, the Government of Myanmar, through its role in the project management committee, had found it difficult to establish dialogue and trust between stakeholders, owing to factors such as political and legal changes, challenges relating to the issue of land rights and relocation and the lack of experience in government-community dialogue and communication. Nonetheless, with the support of external organizations, progress had been made notably through the appointment of community mediators, the launch of a multi-stakeholder advisory group, and cooperation with both local and international civil society organizations as trusted third parties. Improved communication and negotiation, continued sensitization on rights and responsibilities, and replicating the Thilawa model in other special economic zones and resettlement programmes were seen as important next steps.

18. The relocation of the affected community brought economic hardship, loss of land and no alternative training; however, the establishment of a community-driven operational grievance mechanism eventually resulted in some improvements. The mechanism was seen as a bridge between communities and the Government and companies involved, and a relatively easy way to provide remedy. This view was shared by the Government's joint venture partner, the Myanmar Japan Thilawa Development Ltd. The introduction of community advisers and the multi-stakeholder advisory council had helped to ensure sustainable company-community engagement. The Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business, which became involved as a facilitator, had found that initially there was no joint platform for stakeholder dialogue, and thus a common understanding of the problems and possible solutions were difficult to reach. One of the first tasks had been to conduct stakeholder mappings and to create mechanisms by which challenges could be raised and addressed. Other challenges included identifying reliable sources of information, and the

country's complex and fluid legal system. The development of guidelines on responsible conduct for companies joining the project was seen as an essential tool. Key elements of the guidelines included reference to the Guiding Principles and to ILO standards, the Government's expectations and the concerns held by the community.

D. Case study three: Labour rights in Florida's tomato growing industry – United States of America

19. The third case was the Fair Food Program in tomato growing sector in Florida (United States of America), covering the entire value chain from workers to food brands and retailers. Currently covering almost the entire sector in Florida, and with a record of having eliminated previous practices of forced labour, sexual assaults and trafficking, the Program is considered a success by workers, companies and the Government. In the experience of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, which founded the Fair Food Program, it was critical to build a system of enforcement based on a number of mechanisms, including:

- the development of a worker-driven code of conduct for company commitments to be based on the problems experienced by the workers;
- worker-to-worker training to develop an "army of worker monitors";
- a worker-led mechanism to address grievances;
- in-depth audits to complement worker monitoring;
- market consequences for growers and retailers established through legally binding contracts between Coalition of Immokalee Workers and food brands.

20. The Compass Group, a participating company, had found the subtle "carrot and stick" approach adopted by the Coalition of Immokalee Workers compelling and workable, and that, although changing company practice did not happen overnight, it was able to expand the Fair Food Program across other sectors. The experience of the United States Department of Labor, which oversees compliance of agriculture labour standards across the country, was that multi-layered supply chains had made it difficult to establish responsible parties; however, the Fair Food Program, as a leading example of worker-driven enforcement in collaboration with companies, had helped to complement and support government enforcement of standards.

E. Case study four: Multi-stakeholder in the aftermath of the Kingsland factory closure – Cambodia

21. The last case study presented concerned the Kingsland factory in Cambodia, where a subcontractor of a supplier to the company H&M closed down one of its factories in 2012, leaving workers without work and pay. Although the supplier's use of the subcontractor breached its agreement with H&M, which technically did not have any direct legal liability, the company decided that it could help to improve the situation. Through engagement with non-governmental organizations, the Cambodian Arbitration Council, the Government and ILO, workers were compensated. H&M took steps to clarify its expectations to suppliers and set up, in collaboration with trade unions, a whistle-blower system. The case demonstrated the value of workers asserting their rights and pushing large companies to become involved. Participants pointed out that there could be no replacement for worker representation and that dialogue involving all parties – workers, the brand company, suppliers, the Government and ILO – was vital.

IV. Reflections from the Forum sessions on "Multi-stakeholder engagement across all three pillars"

22. Several insights and lessons learned were derived from the discussions at the "Multi-stakeholder engagement across all three pillars" sessions. As a whole they attempt to reflect the state of play of multi-stakeholder engagement across the "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework – albeit with a small sample of four cases. The observations are as follows.

23. **The "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework is a valuable reference point for multi-stakeholder efforts even if it is not the initial impetus for action**. The initiatives discussed during the annual Forum were not established to implement the Guiding Principles per se. Arguably, this is also the case for a wide range of policies, practices and projects (whether of States, business, or civil society) presented at the Forum. Nonetheless, the stakeholders presenting cases in these sessions all made it clear that the three-pillar framework and substance of the Guiding Principles can function as a reference point to support everyone involved to confront their duties/responsibilities, enhance thinking about ways forward and assist with further calibration of the respective roles, and expectations, of each stakeholder. This somewhat seamless link to existing – and in some instances well established – social change efforts on the ground arguably confirms that the Guiding Principles are not only grounded in international human rights law but also resonate with approaches to local problem solving.[5]

24. **There is no one-size-fits-all formula for what or who triggers collective action:** Based on the experience of the cases/efforts presented in these sessions, local multi-stakeholder efforts are initiated in response to various issues and by diverse actors. The impetus for action that involves all stakeholder groups can come from a range of issues, including: a demand for remediation/investigation from rights-holders around a standard linked to public financing; recognition that existing sustainability/development projects have "orphan" human rights issues that no stakeholder wants to tackle; the failure of a business partner to respect rights; or an investigation into a specific issue. Related, in the cases discussed the initial leadership came from diverse sources, such as local workers or communities, international NGO research campaigns or as a result of corporate human rights due diligence. While this may be a function of the cases discussed, it is worth noting that none of the collective action efforts appear to have been triggered by the State.

25. **Trusted evidence is key to overcoming stand-offs and paralysis, but reaching a meeting of minds takes work on all sides, and leadership from individuals is needed:** Some of the presenters in these sessions explicitly noted that prior to the efforts they are now involved in, there was a feeling of stand-off between stakeholders and an impasse on progress. In the face of this, establishing a trusted evidence base to understand the realities on the ground appears to be key. This can unlock unhelpful perceptions which make all actors feel comfortable that they are doing their part, and someone else is the problem. The investment in creating this evidence base may often come from civil society conducting credible, neutral research and engaging with rights-holders. However, even with an evidence base, it appears it is not always easy to achieve a shared analysis of the problems and ways forward. In all the cases discussed, presenters expressed appreciation for how other stakeholders came to the table with a positive, patient, direct and constructive attitude

[5] Indeed, as former Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, John Ruggie, underlined in the introduction to the Guiding Principles (paragraph 11 of A/HRC/17/31): "In short, the Guiding Principles aim not only to provide guidance that is practical, but also guidance informed by actual practice."

when engaging with the original evidence. However, it was also noted that this was often due to the leadership, character and will of key leaders who then worked to bring along colleagues and peers.

26. **Achieving real engagement with tangible outcomes when government, business and civil society work together seems to require certain key elements even in diverse cases:** The four cases discussed across the two sessions are at different stages of development. Nonetheless, it was possible to discern some key elements that underpin real action and progress. Note that the older and more mature the initiative, the stronger – or more binding and public – the elements appear to be. Common threads included:

(a) **Explicit agreements** - All parties need to engage in a written agreement that sets out shared goals and modes of working. In some instances, this may be a memorandum of understanding. In others, it might be a legally binding contract.

(b) **Holistic and detailed action plans** - A diversity of interrelated actions and projects ranging from policy/legal changes to capacity building efforts to effective monitoring need to be planned even when targeting one human rights outcome. For each of these, detailed work setting out what each actor is expected to do is required.

(c) **Time and money** - One case presented set out a 10-year time horizon for success. One company representative noted that reaching internal agreement to engage and take a specific course of action inside large organisations takes time. Another presenter referenced that achieving full labour rights protection for one product in a finite number of farms cannot be done "on the cheap". In other words, addressing challenges as complex as those discussed will take substantial time and money, even in situations where there are willing actors from diverse stakeholder groups.

(d) **Tracking and monitoring** - Each of the presenters discussed the importance of tracking progress against action plans and goals agreed. This includes retaining an appreciation for how much more work is needed, but also recognition of tangible achievements along the way.

(e) **Mutual accountability and enforcement** – A challenge for any multi-stakeholder effort is ensuring that everyone is accountable, in a real sense, for delivering on their duties and responsibilities. One of the presenters from a more evolved case example articulated that binding requirements are critical to enable rights-holders to seek remedy if commitments are not met.

(f) **Shared learning and knowledge creation** – Several presenters noted that agreements and action plans to which diverse actors and institutions are committed can provide a framework and "container" in which shared learning occurs, and help create new shared knowledge not previously captured by any one actor. In more established examples of collective action, this includes the ability to learn from and discuss failed efforts or sub-par outcomes.

27. **Change will often require broad-based, organised action and building/supporting the capacity of the key stakeholders to sustain engagement.** Although a few actors may initiate, direct and drive local multi-stakeholder action, making progress on specific cases requires buy-in and coordinated action from a wider number of actors. Beyond the challenge of building commitment to new behaviours, incentives and practices, presenters also shared the need to define implementation arrangements so that each actor is clear about their role and relationship to others. Further, the eco-system of actors/institutions may lack certain capacities. For example, one presentation outlined the need for mediators to support dialogue between rights-holders, business and the State.

28. **Putting the human rights, experiences and voices of affected individuals and communities at the core of local multi-stakeholder projects is critical and possible, but**

not easy. In each of the cases presented, speakers referenced the importance of direct engagement with rights-holders – whether growers, workers in the supply chain or affected communities – into the multi-stakeholder effort. On the one hand this is about ensuring that the third pillar of the Guiding Principles, access to remedy, is activated into projects and processes from the beginning. On the other hand, it is about meaningful consultation with potentially affected groups, integrating the knowledge and know-how of rights-holders into the crafting of new policies, rules, standards or business practices, as set out in the second pillar of the Guiding Principles. At the same time, it is clear that direct engagement with rights-holders can require the support of interlocutors (especially from civil society or worker organisations) who are committed to investing resources and support to amplify key voices. A related observation is that business representatives valued engagement from rights-holders that was systematic and focused on concrete outcomes.

29. **Some lessons learned by business leaders on how "carrot and stick" approaches may bring about and sustain constructive multi-stakeholder engagement**:

- while audits and certification schemes may indicate that suppliers are meeting standards, these may not pick up the underlying systemic structural issues, and NGOs can play a key role in bringing these to light, and thus informing human rights due diligence;
- business leaders recognize that the "carrot and stick" approach that rights groups and civil society organisations can play a constructive role. Such strategies/tactics might even provide opportunities for business leaders to leverage suppliers and the wider industry;
- sometimes the company needs to use its leverage – indeed use a "carrot and stick" approach – to bring stakeholders and interest groups to the table and get their buy-in to the vision of multi-stakeholder solutions that work.

30. **The engagement of government is critical, and the State has entirely unique capabilities to bring to bear to address critical and urgent business-related human rights challenges**. Across each of the cases presented and issues discussed it was clear that – consistent with the Guiding Principles – government needs to be active in supporting local efforts. It is not enough to set only high-level policy aspirations and expect stakeholders to resolve issues. For example, only government can set investment policy, establish social and environmental safeguards around public financing standards, create and enforce the right legal and policy framework, and scale successful efforts. Further, the cases demonstrated that even when addressing one specific issue or a set of human rights issues at a sub-national level, diverse aspects of government must be around the table. These include different ministries, as well as local and federal departments/leaders, and home and host State representatives. This need for diverse government representation reflects the sheer size and complexity of some of the issues that the cases presented at the Forum are seeking to address.

31. **The annual United Nations Forum can serve as a platform for individuals and organisations to present their local work and challenges**. As well offering valuable insights about the dynamics of local action across all three pillars of the Guiding Principles, it was noted that the Forum allows stakeholders who are not regularly invited to present at the United Nations to talk about their issues and work. It was noted that participation in the Forum provides, among other things:

- an impetus for presenters to establish shared lessons, challenges and priorities;
- a rare opportunity to engage as a group with international experts and gain guidance/ideas about ways forward; and
- a chance to profile work in order to build support to deepen or scale up projects.

V. Working Group conclusions and recommendations

32. The Working Group welcomes the constructive contributions of the stakeholders that shared their experiences of joint engagement to address specific human rights concerns in the context of business operations. It has received feedback from a range of Forum participants that these sessions were a useful and innovative part of the programme. The Working Group is planning to continue its efforts to identify cases of multi-stakeholder action to implement the Guiding Principles across all three pillars, and to facilitate dialogue for wider dissemination of lessons learnt and "cross-fertilization" at the annual Forum also in 2016 and beyond.

33. The Working Group considers that the kinds of approaches featured at the Forum, focused as they were on finding solutions and improving situations in local contexts, should be emulated to a much greater extent. When there is genuine engagement from all sides, significant progress can be made in preventing and addressing human rights impacts of business activities.

34. Recommendations to civil society organisations:

(a) As demonstrated by the cases presented at the annual Forum, NGOs can play a particularly helpful role in helping to establish facts concerning business-related human rights impacts in concrete situations and supporting trust-building and stakeholder dialogue to prevent and address negative impacts. Often such constructive engagement may arise from investigative efforts to shed light on human rights concerns and negative impacts, but where companies are willing to engage with NGOs on such findings, it is clear that all parties stand to gain. At the same time, where companies are not willing to engage with civil society and affected stakeholders in addressing concerns, the traditional approaches of campaigning, "naming and shaming" and litigation will still be valid and may also provide additional incentives for companies' action;

(b) In order to encourage further learning and the spread of innovative engagement between NGOs, business and governments to address concrete business-related challenges, the Working Group would like to encourage NGOs to share more examples of joint efforts undertaken in specific cases at future sessions of the Forum.

35. Recommendations to business enterprises and organisations:

(a) Effective stakeholder engagement to understand human rights risks to individuals and communities is a core element of human rights due diligence processes, and all companies across all sectors – and especially those that are less familiar with working closely with civil society organisations and affected communities and workers – should learn from successful multi-stakeholder engagement efforts, such as those featured at the Forum;

(b) The Working Group would also like to encourage companies and business and industry organisations to share more examples of joint efforts undertaken in specific situations and actively contribute to lesson-sharing and dialogue around such engagement at the annual Forum.

36. Recommendations to States:

(a) Effective multi-stakeholder engagement has great potential for leading to better protection of human rights in the context of investment projects and supply chains, as a means for affected stakeholders to voice concerns, support human rights due diligence, and jointly tackle negative impacts – and thereby building trust and lowering conflict, and eventually leading to more sustainable development outcomes

in which human rights are protected and respected. Host States have a particular role – and obligation – to contribute to such engagement through active participation in stakeholder mechanisms, support to affected stakeholders, clear guidance and expectations to companies, and a conducive environment for NGOs to help identify human rights impacts and support multi-stakeholder dialogue. Home/donor States also have a responsibility to support such engagement;

(b) The Working Group calls on more Governments to play an active role in dialogue at the annual Forum to share experiences and perspectives on multi-stakeholder engagement to address business-related human rights challenges in concrete local contexts. It also encourages Governments to support efforts to research and promote lessons from case studies of multi-stakeholder engagement across "Protect, Respect and Remedy".

37. Recommendations to all stakeholders:

(a) The Working Group encourages all stakeholders to highlight existing, concrete practices of joint stakeholder engagement to address challenges across the "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework, and to share such examples in other relevant contexts such as regional forums and meetings convened by stakeholders themselves.